

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office Action. Claims 1-21 were examined. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 19 are amended. No claims are canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

No New Matter

Support for the amendments is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., at paragraphs [0051]-[0052] of the published patent application. Therefore, no new matter is added by the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 8-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,715,279 to Pavlovic et al. ("Pavlovic"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Pavlovic discloses a digital printing system including a plurality of decomposers that operate simultaneously and independently to output page images of decomposed data at random times. The output page images are retained in a buffer until requested by a marker which controls the printer hardware. A buffer manager records where in the buffer each page is stored so that the necessary page images can be reassembled for printing. See, e.g., Abstract.

On the other hand, Applicant's claims are directed to processing a print batch, wherein characteristics of the print jobs in the print batch are evaluated to independently determine (1) a pick order (e.g., order which print media or paper is selected), (2) a transfer order (order which the print jobs pooled in the formatter are transferred to the imaging component), and (3) a delivery order (e.g., order which the final finished or physically imaged pages are to be formed and delivered to the print engine for output at the print tray).

Specifically, claim 8 is amended to recite "evaluating characteristics of said print batch to independently determine a pick order; . . . evaluating said characteristics to independently determine a transfer order of said print jobs from a formatter to an imaging component; . . . evaluating said characteristics to independently determine a delivery order of said media sheets" (emphasis added). Pavlovic does not disclose or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action states that the delivery order in Pavlovic is determined "since the files transferred to the printer hardware are in reverse order, the delivery of the respective files to be printed and finished by the printer hardware and the finisher are also in reverse order." This teaches against "independently determining" because the delivery order in Pavlovic is necessarily tied to the transfer order by the Office Action's own admission. Furthermore, the ordering in Pavlovic is determined by the page order in the job description, and therefore is not independently determined.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 8 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 9-14 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 recites “to independently determine a pick order for different types of print media to be used for different print jobs, independently determine a transfer order for transferring rasterized print job data to said imaging component, and independently determine a delivery order of said print jobs” (emphasis added). Pavlovic does not disclose or suggest at least these recitations as discussed above for claim 8.

In addition, claim 15 is amended to further recite “such that the picking order, the transfer order, and the delivery order are each distinct from one another.” There is no disclosure in Pavlovic that the picking order, the transfer order, and the delivery order are each distinct from one another. To the contrary, each of the orders in Pavlovic is determined by the page order in the job description.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 15 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 15, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 16-18 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 recites “means for independently determining a pick order, independently determining a transfer order, and independently determining a delivery order based on said characteristics, wherein the picking order, the transfer order, and the

delivery order are either distinct from one another or the same as one another” (emphasis added). Pavlovic does not disclose or suggest at least these recitations as discussed above for claim 15.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 19 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19.

Claims 20-21 depend from claim 19, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 20-21 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20-21 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pavlovic in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,117 to Kageyama et al. (“Kageyama”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to recite “independently determining a pick order, independently determining a transfer order, and independently determining a delivery order based, at least in part, on said characteristics, such that the picking order, the transfer order, and the delivery order are each distinct from one another” (emphasis added). Pavlovic does not teach or suggest at least these recitations, as discussed above for claim 15. Nor does Kageyama supply support for the missing recitations in Pavlovic.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2-7 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-7 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Mark D. Trenner/

Dated: September 19, 2008

By: _____

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708